Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know under whose management the forests till now under the control of the Military department are at present ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR : —" Notice, Sir."

Cost of training in the Forest College at Coimbatore.

* 1038 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY : With reference to my question No. 190 answered on 9th August 1929, will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the net cost to the Government for each Madras student trained at the Forest College in Coimbatore ;

(b) whether the full cost of training is charged to the students of Indian States and other provincial administrations and if not, why not ; and

(c) whether there has ever been any proposal to transfer the Forest College to the charge of the Government of India ?

A.—(a) The net cost to Government for each Madras student trained at the Madras Forest College during the last five years was as follows :—

	RS.
1924-25	1,337
1925-26	1,310
1926-27	1,206
1927-28	1,278
1928-29	1,997

These figures do not include pay which would have to be met in any case, nor travelling allowance and nothing is charged on account of the original cost and upkeep of the college estate and buildings.

(b) The estimated full cost of training is charged to the students of Indian States and other Provincial administrations.

(c) No.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" May I know why the cost of training a student has gone up from Rs. 1,278 in 1927-28 to Rs. 1,997 in 1928-29 ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It depends on the cost of provisions and many other things."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" May I know whether the Government have considered the advisability of handing over the Forest College to the Government of India ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" No, Sir."

Jails

Supply of boots to the Police by jails.

* 1039 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the proportion in which the requirements of the police and other consuming departments of the Government as regards boots are met by (1) the Jails department, (2) Pallavaram Criminal Settlement, and (3) other agencies, if any ;

20th January 1930]

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"May I know what is the test they would apply to this and whether they would treat it as a productive scheme or a protective one?" 11-15 a.m.

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"That question will be considered when we receive the report and consider the financial aspect."

Prevention of the submersion of lands in Chintamani, Trichinopoly taluk.

* 1045 Q.—Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state what are the various proposals that were considered or are still under the consideration of the Government to prevent submersion of lands in Chintamani, Trichinopoly taluk, Trichinopoly district, at flood time?

A.—No proposal to prevent the submersion of lands to Chintamani, Trichinopoly taluk, Trichinopoly district, has been or is under the consideration of the Government.

One of the proposals made for the reclamation of the sanded lands in the Murungapettai area was to use the low-lying lands near St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, as a dumping ground for the sand which was expected to be available if the Murungapettai area was cleared of it. The proposal contemplated the acquisition of lands in Chintamani by Government, raising their level and making them available for building purposes. It has since been reported, however, that if the Murungapettai High Level Channel scheme which is now under separate consideration is sanctioned, there would not be enough sand for raising the low-lying lands in the Trichinopoly town. The Government are therefore awaiting a decision on the Murungapettai High Level Channel scheme.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"May I know whether there was not a project to divert the surplus water to certain portions near Mulligudi?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"I must ask for notice of the question."

Land Revenue

Levy of ground-rent in Trichinopoly municipality.

* 1046 Q.—Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in August 1925, vacant sites on the Butterworth Road, Teppakulam, Trichinopoly, were sold in auction for the erection of houses, by the municipality, on the authority of the Government;

(b) whether it is a fact that in 1925, 1926, 1927, there was a levy of about 3 annas per plot as land tax, but no collection of ground-rent either by the Revenue authorities or by the municipality;

(c) whether in 1928 a ground-rent of Rs. 23 per site was collected under threat of coercive proceedings;

(d) whether it is a fact that the sales of the vacant house-sites in question took place subsequent to G.O. No. 1016, Revenue, dated 29th June 1923;

(e) whether the lands on which a ground-rent has been levied have been converted into buildings for dwelling purposes and there are no longer vacant lands assessable on that basis;